

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 12, 2004 LB 227

Next Friday, February 20, is the deadline for designating senator and committee priority bills, and the letter designating such should be delivered to my office and a copy to the Clerk's Office prior to adjournment on next Friday. And then the deadline for me to designate a Speaker priority bill is next Thursday, the 19th of February, at 5:00. And I, if someone wants me to consider a Speaker priority designation, I will need a request letter from the principal introducer by 5:00 on the 19th of February. And I'd appreciate if the letter would explain the rationale for the senator's request to designate that bill as a priority. Sorry to interrupt you. Thank you, I wanted to make that announcement.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Speaker Bromm. Mr. Clerk. Senator Hartnett, you may open on your amendment, FA1454.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Mr. President, members of the body, I think my amendment was taken care of with Senator Beutler's amendment, so I will withdraw my amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: It is withdrawn.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Any discussion on advancement? Senator Landis, your light was on. Did you wish to...

SENATOR LANDIS: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I voted for the Beutler amendment because I think it's a good faith attempt to harmonize interests. I realize in this debate that the point at which I was concerned and wanted to express myself must have occurred under the radar the last time we were visited by this topic, because the place that I wanted to express myself was whether or not kids, somebody, could ride in the back of a pickup. And that issue really isn't in front of us. I think what we're being told by the proponents of LB 227 is that that rule has already been made and the answer is no, not without an appropriate child restraint. That's what you got to do. But, in fact, this bill does not address that problem. It just simply clarifies a rule that was already in effect when we did the child restraint law, which was that if